

Serial No.: 09/246,409

Attorney Docket No. 1999P07454US

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending.

Claims 1, 2, 9, and 10 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Kennedy, U.S. Patent No. 6,330,589 ("Kennedy") in view of Bailey et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,835,084 ("Bailey"). Applicants respectfully submit that the claimed invention is not taught, suggested, or implied by Kennedy or Bailey, either singly or in combination.

As described in the Specification and in response to previous Official Action, one aspect of the present invention relates to handling of threaded messages. As used in the context of embodiments of the present invention, messages may be "threaded" when forwarded with attached materials, i.e., when a portion of a previous message is included within a succeeding message. For example, a voice message or e-mail message may be forwarded (or replied-to) with additional comments. Furthermore, to prevent redundant playback or display of threaded-in messages, embodiments of the present invention allow accessing of messages that form part of the thread when a message containing the thread is accessed. Additionally, in certain embodiments, only the *new content* of a threaded message, along with a pointer to the components is stored, rather than repeatedly storing the same messages.

Thus, claim 1 recites "wherein said memory stores only new content of messages threaded within other messages;" claim 2 recites "wherein said memory is configured to store only new content of a threaded message;" claim 9 recites "wherein only new content of a threaded message is stored;" and claim 10 recites "wherein at least a portion of said one or more first messages is included within said one or more second messages, wherein only new content of a threaded message is stored."

In contrast, as discussed in response to the previous Official Action, Applicants respectfully submit that Kennedy does not relate to accessing a message contained in another message, or indicating accessing, as generally recited in the claims at issue. For example, if a message A contains messages B and C, then accessing A will access B and C. In contrast, while Kennedy provides a message tree, *accessing one message in the tree does not appear to have any effect on*

Serial No.: 09/246,409

Attorney Docket No. 1999P07454US

accessing a related branch message.

Furthermore, Kennedy appears to store messages in the tree in their entirety, rather than only new content of threaded messages, as recited in the claims at issue. Thus, for example, at Column 3, lines 3-29, Kennedy describes retrieving message-related information from a database to determine if a message has been downloaded yet. If it has not, then the message is downloaded in its entirety; this "entire process is performed for each remaining *message* on the server..."

The Examiner's attention is directed to FIG. 4d of Kennedy. FIG. 4d illustrates Messages 1-8. For example, Message 1 includes message content A and Message 2 includes message content A and message content B. *In operation, while Kennedy provides indexing of the fact that content A is embedded in Message 2, Kennedy downloads the entirety of Message 2 (including both content A and content B), even after Message 1 has been downloaded.* (See also, Col. 13, line 66, discussion of FIG. 6) ("Message 2 is downloaded..."). In contrast, in the present invention, the redundant downloading of content threaded messages is eliminated. That is, in the present invention, only content B would be downloaded when with Message 2.

The Examiner's attention is further directed to Col. 17, lines 38-51, of Kennedy. Message 7 having content D, E, F, and G has been downloaded. A Message 8 has message content A, D, and E. As Kennedy states, "[t]he *message [8] is downloaded...*" even though content D and E presumably has already been downloaded with Message 7.

In contrast, in the present invention, the redundant downloading of content threaded messages is eliminated. That is, in the present invention, only content A would be downloaded. Thus, if anything, Kennedy is representative of problems solved by the present invention, which stores only new content of messages threaded within other messages.

Bailey is relied on merely for illustrating a display. Applicants note that the relevant limitation has been deleted from claim 9. With reference to Claim 1, however, Applicants note that, like Kennedy, Bailey does not appear to relate to storing only new content in threaded messages.

Serial No.: 09/246,409

Attorney Docket No. 1999P07454US

As such, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections of the claims.

Claims 3-7, 11-15, and 17-20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Kennedy in view of Hicks, U.S. Patent No. 6,304,573 B1 ("Hicks"). Applicants respectfully submit that there are elements of the claimed invention that are not taught, suggested or implied by Kennedy or Hicks, either singly or in combination. Kennedy has been discussed above. Hicks relates merely to storing voice messages. Thus, like Kennedy, Hicks also fails to teach, suggest or imply threading or identifying threading or accessing threaded messages as generally recited in the claims at issue. As such, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections of the claims.

Claims 8 and 16 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kennedy in view of Bailey and Lytle, et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,549,950 ("Lytle"). Applicants respectfully submit that there are elements of the claimed invention that are not taught, suggested or implied by Kennedy, Bailey, or Lytle, either singly or in combination. Lytle is relied on for allegedly teaching an e-mail reply to an original e-mail message. Assuming this is true, Lytle, appears to be representative of the problem solved by the present invention and, like Kennedy does not appear to relate to handling or identifying threaded messages as generally recited in the claims. As such, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections of the claims.

For all of the above reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that the application is in condition for allowance, which allowance is earnestly solicited.

Date: 27 Jan. 06

Respectfully submitted,

SIEMENS CORPORATION
Customer Number: 28524
Intellectual Property Department
170 Wood Avenue South
Iselin, New Jersey 08830
ATTENTION: Elsa Keller, IP Department
Telephone: (732) 321-3026

By: 

David D. Chung
Registration No. 38,409
Attorney for Applicants
Tel: 650-694-5339
Fax: 650-968-4517